DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 312 176 SO 020 260

AUTHOR Molinaro, Julia A.
TITLE An Annotated Bibliography Dealing with Some Implications of Two Art Education Reform Movements.
PUB DATE Apr 89
NOTE 84p.; Exit Project, Indiana University, South Bend.
PUB TYPE Reference Materials - Bibliographies (131) -- Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Aesthetic Education; Annotated Bibliographies; Art Activities; *Art Education; *Art History; Art Teachers; Curriculum Design; Curriculum Enrichment; Elementary Secondary Education; Teacher Education
IDENTIFIERS *Discipline Based Art Education

ABSTRACT

Efforts to renew cultural literacy and reform arts education sponsored by the National Endowment for the Arts and the Getty Center for Education in the Arts suggest fundamental changes relating to the scope of art curricula. The single greatest drawback of existing art curricula and the guides that teachers use is the emphasis on skill development at the expense of the art form as a whole. A shift in philosophy and curricular practice for art education would require changes in art teacher training programs so that new art teachers would be prepared to teach the cultural realms in art with the same enthusiasm and skill that they now teach the production of art. The bibliographic annotations which form the core of this study are composed of three parts. Part 1 is a review of the literature concerned with humanities and cultural aspects of education as they relate to curriculum reform and teacher preparation (2 citations). Part 2 reviews the literature pertaining to art education reform movements and their orientations toward changes in curriculum, teacher preparation, and the role of the museum (20 citations). Part 3 is a review of the museum education literature addressing the museum's function and role in various educational relationships (8 citations). The paper's final section offers a summary, conclusions, and recommendations. (PPB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED312176

AN ANNOTATED BIBILOGRAPHY DEALING WITH SOME IMPLICATIONS OF TWO ART EDUCATION REFORM MOVEMENTS

By

Julia A. Molinaro

Study Directed By

Charles R. DuVall, Ph.D

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the course S591--Exit Project
Indiana University at South Bend
April 1989

SO 020 264

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Julia A. Molinaro

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
INTRODUCTION		1
Statement of the Problem		3
Purpose of the Study		3
Organization of the Study		3
Limitations of the Study		4
Glossary		5
ANNOTATIONS		
Part I.	A review of the literature concerned with humanities and cultural aspects of education as they relate to curriculum reform and teacher preparation	9
Part II.	A review of the literature pertaining to art education reform movements sponsored by The National Endowment for the Arts and The Getty Center for Education in the Arts and their orientations regarding changes in curriculum, teacher preparation, and the role of the museum	11
Part III.	A review of the museum education literature addressing the museum's function as an educator, the nature of learning in museums, the role of the museum educator, and the museum-school relationship	29
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS		
Summary		37
Conclusions		75
Recommendations		76
BIBLIOGRAPHY		78
STUDENT QUALIFICATIONS		81

INTRODUCTION

Efforts to renew cultural literacy and reform arts education sponsored by The National Endowment for the Arts and The Getty Center for Education in the Arts suggest fundamental changes relating to the scope of arts curricula (MacGregor 1986:84). The NEA in its publication Toward Civilization: A Report on Arts Education (1988) emphasized "The single greatest drawback of existing arts curricula and guides which teachers use is their emphasis on skill development at the expense of the art form as a whole." (75), and that there is "...growing agreement that arts curricula should include great examples of our culture's visual history" (71).

This shift in philosophy and curricular practice for art education would according to Miller (1983) require "...changes in art teacher training programs so that new art teachers would be prepared to teach the cultural realms in art with the same enthusiasm and skill that they now teach in the production of art." (37). Along a similar line, Zeller (1987) noted "Though the ultimate responsibility for providing teachers with the knowledge and skills in art history, criticism, and aesthetics, rests with higher education, and will be achieved only through a major reform of preservice training programs, museum educators are making a contribution to inservice training designed to help teachers take the integrated approach..." (52). In light of these reform movements' renewed cultural orientation there are also those such as the Commission on Museums for a New

Century (1984) who "...believe the museum-school relationship shows considerable potential for the future." (68).

Clearly this art education reform literature indicates implications of significance for art educators, those institutions who train them, and cultural institutions as well.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The emergence of art education reform movements sponsored by The National Endowment for the Arts and The Getty Center for Education in the Arts, and their mutual orientation toward cultural literacy and a widened curricular scope merits an investigation into some implications these reforms have for the schools and their teachers, university teacher training programs, and museums and the museum educator.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study is to show the influence that The National Endowment for the Arts and The Getty Center for Education in the Arts continue to have on art education reform. A brief auxiliary issue deals with the contribution these reforms could make toward public education reform in general. One aspect which surfaced in the literature concerns implications of NEA and Getty Center reforms for institutions of higher learning and teacher training programs. A further aspect of the literature is a potential partnership between schools and museums. The study also introduces the reader to the nature, possibilities and implications of art education which includes more than art production.

ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY

The study was comprised of three sections.. Part I. was a review of the literature of two public education reformers concerned with humanities and cultural aspects of education as they relate to curriculum reform and teacher

preparation. Part II. consisted of a review of the literature pertaining to art education reform movements sponsored by NEA and the Getty Center and their orientations regarding changes in curriculum, teacher preparation and certification, and the role of the museum. Part III. was a review of museum education literature which addressed the museum's function as an educator, the nature of learning in museums, the role of the museum educator, and the museum-school relationship. All annotations are chronologically arranged.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

Limitations experienced in the course of this project were time constraints (even with an extension), a significant lack of research data pertaining to DBAE, "basic arts education", museum education and object centered learning, and the evolving state of flux these art education reform movements are currently in.

GLOSSARY

aesthetic: "adj. (1) pertaining to aesthetics or to the beautiful as the quality either of an object or of an experience; (2) pertaining to whatever is immediately experienced or felt, as distinguished from what is arrived at by mediate inference or reasoning" (Good 1973:18).

aesthetic perception: types of: "a term that refers to special types of perception which seem to depend on general physical constitution and to be the expression of an individual's personality; such types are sometimes divided into objective, physiological, associative, and character types and bear relationship to the thinking, sensation, feeling, and intuitive types of Jung and to the modern artistic styles of realism, expressionism, surrealism, and constructivism" (Good 1973:19).

aesthetics: "(1) the systematic study of beauty, especially as manifested in the fine arts; (2) the branch of inquiry that deals with the nature of beauty and the principles governing its production and evaluation; (3) the study of ones responses to artistic and immediately sensuous phenomena" (Good 1973:19).

art: "human activities aimed at the accomplishment of or participation in aesthetic experience; in common usage activities that involve creative ability, ingenuity, judgment, and skill, resulting in an object or artifact" (Good 1973:40).

art education: "instruction and practice in the visual and spatial arts, as carried on in the schools: frequently recognized major areas are fine, industrial, graphic, and theatre arts; specific visual arts include drawing, design, color, construction, history of art, and art appreciation" (Good 1973:40).

art, fine: "the conscious use of creative imagination in the production of objects or expressive forms and intended for ones aesthetic experience" (Good 1973:40).

art production: "the direct experience of creating art...Learning about materials, acquiring techniques, gaining perceptual skills, and developing imagination through resolving the ambiguity inherent in the creative process..." (Spratt 1987:157).

Arts, visual and spatial: "a term used by artists, authors, and art educators to embrace the entire field of art variously designated as visual arts, spatial arts, or

fine, industrial, and related arts; introduced into the nomenclature of art education in an attempt to coin a term that would avoid the distinction implied between fine and not fine, practical and impractical, or useful and nonuseful concepts of art, includes the following areas of study: art appreciation, architecture, sculpture, painting, industrial art, graphic art, advertising art, domestic or household art, civic art, theatre art, and history of art" (Good 1973:43).

basic arts education: "Basic arts education aims to provide all students, not only the gifted and talented, with knowledge of and skills in the arts. Basic arts education includes the disciplines of visual art, music, dance and theatre. Like other school subjects, basic arts education must be taught sequentially by qualified teachers; instruction must include the history, critical theory, and ideas of the arts as well as creation, production, and performance; and knowledge of, and skills in, the arts must be tested. As for other school subjects, appropriate resources--classroom time, administrative support, and textbooks--must be provided to this end." (Indiana Alliance for Arts Education Vol. 2, #1, 1988:2).

criticism, art: "(1) evaluating and/or analyzing with knowledge and rational criteria works of art, literature, drama, etc.: (2) an attempt to explain or give reasons for ones response to, liking for, or evaluation of an art work" (Good 1973:154).

cultural literacy: according to E. D. Hirsch, Jr. "It is a basic understanding of the combination of these areas of learning--the arts, humanities, and sciences." (National Endowment for the Arts 1988:14).

curator: "The curator is the scholarly and research subject-matter expert of the museum. He studies, identifies, and arranges the collection or his part of it, suggests acquisitions, originates exhibit, does research, writes catalogs or other publication, and represents the museum in his portion of the scholarly world. He is also responsible for protecting, preserving, and conserving the collection and for keeping proper records of it, though he may work with a conservator and registrar in these fields" (American Association of Museums 1973:17).

discipline-based art education (DBAE): "an approach to teaching art; The focus of discipline-based art instruction is on art within general education and within the context of aesthetic education. Four parent disciplines--aesthetics, studio art (art production), art history, and art criticism--are taught by means of a formal continuous, sequential, written

curriculum across grade levels in the same way as other academic subjects" (Greer 1984:212).

docent: "(1) one who explains exhibits in a museum; (2) a member of a teaching staff below professional rank in a college or university" (Good 1973:193).

history of art: "as a school subject, the study of an organized body of materials dealing with art expression through the ages, with specific periods or schools of art in their relation to the general development of art, and with the lives and works of artists having historical significance, such a study being undertaken with a view to increasing and enriching the student's appreciation of art works, whether old or new, and to supplying him with an historical perspective by which to see and understand better the current tendencies in art" (Good 1973:283).

humanities: "(1) a term used currently by many schools and colleges in the United States to designate comprehensive courses in literature, language, art, philosophy, religion, and history, thus distinguishing the humanities from social science and the natural sciences; (2) whatever concerns man as distinct from physical nature, especially achievements of humanity in literature and art; (3) as used in the Renaissance period, the term designated the "more human letters" of recently revived Greek and Latin writers in contrast to the theological letters of the medieval schoolmen; (4) frequently has been used to designate courses in, or the study of, classical languages (Latin and Greek) and classical literature and art; (5) today the term humanities includes also masterpieces of modern literature, art and science, as being equally "creations of the free spirit of man" (Good 1973:288).

interdisciplinary approach: "a method of study by which experts, or the best research workers from many different fields of learning, are brought together in the examination of a particular problem that is relevant to all their approaches; for example, a child-development problem may be studied by a team composed of psychologist, doctor, social psychologist, educator, psychiatrist, and sociologist" (Good 1973:311).

literacy, visual: "intelligent, critical response to visual stimuli, such as television programs, motion pictures, paintings, etc." (Good 1973:342).

museum: "(1) a building or room used to preserve and exhibit collections of objects of interest in such fields

as science, literature, and art; (2) the collection exhibited in such a room or building" (Good 1973:378).

museum education: "(1) those changes brought about in the individual through ideas suggested or communicated by museum materials and their arrangement; (2) the formal or informal educational program carried on by museums" (Good 1973:378).

object centered learning: "learning relating to what constitutes a "real object", how objects communicate, and how they are meaningful" (W. K. Kellogg Foundation 1988:16).

perception: "(1) in its most limited sense, awareness of external objects, conditions, relationships, etc., as a result of sensory stimulation; (2) a continuous process of integration of present and past sensory impressions; (3) more broadly, awareness of whatever sort, however brought about" (Good 1973:413).

sensory education: "in Montessori usage, educational activities to refine the senses (auditory, visual, gustatory, olfactory, tactile) to higher sensitivity and to develop the capacity to appreciate fine differences in stimuli" (Good 1973:527).

ANNOTATIONS

Part I. A review of the Paideia Proposal and American Memory: A Report on the Humanities in the Nation's Public Schools as they relate to curriculum reform and teacher preparation

Adler, Mortimer. The Paideia Proposal. New York, N. Y.: MacMillan Publishing Co., 1982.

Mortimer Adler wrote The Paideia Proposal on behalf of the Paideia Group which consisted of twenty-one eminent scholars and educators (vii, viii). The Paideia Proposal was an eloquent statement which addressed educational reform and was divided into four sections (ix, x). Section I "The Schooling of A People" stated that the public schools have failed to produce an educated electorate (4). Section II "The Essentials of Basic Schooling" concluded that a democratic society must provide equal educational opportunities, and that this ideal is still unfulfilled (15). The Paideia Group agreed a basic education must be "general", "liberal", "non-specialized", and "non-vocational" (18). The Group also stipulated subject areas integral to a Basic Education and discussed the "Three Modes of Learning": "organized knowledge", "development of skills", and "enlargement of understanding" (24, 26, 27, 29, 31).. Section III "Teaching and Learning" addressed the issue of teacher reform and the necessary skills teachers need to effectively teach the Three Modes of Learning (51, 52, 53, 54). Regarding teacher reform Adler stated "The present teacher training programs turn out persons who are not sufficiently equipped with the knowledge, the intellectual skills, or the developed understanding needed to guide and help the young in the course of study we have recommended" (60). The Paideia Group advised that college should be "liberal and non-specialized", and specialized training should occur only at the graduate level (60). Section IV "Beyond Basic Schooling" stated "But there is one more reason for exerting every effort to improve basic schooling. We must also do it to preserve our free institutions." (77).

Cheney, L. V. American Memory: A Report on the Humanities in the Nation's Public Schools. Washington, D.C.: National Endowment for the Humanities, 1987.

American Memory was a study sponsored by the National Endowment for the Humanities to evaluate the state of arts education in the country's public schools (forward). Cheney convened advisory groups on history, literature, and foreign language composed of scholars, teachers, and administrators and "...they agreed that there is a reason for serious concern about humanities education in U.S. schools" (forward). In the first section of this report "The Humanities and the Nation" Cheney traced education pendulum swings from The Committee of Ten and their emphasis on cultural content, to the shift to vocationally oriented education, the changes from "History" to Social Studies: and "English" to "Language Arts" and the emphasis of process learning rather than content learning (7, 8, 9, 10). In the second section "Textbooks" Cheney stated "Textbooks are tangible evidence of how little we are doing to make our children shareholders in their cultural heritage. Vacuous texts that contain little classic literature or history and instead conform to readability formulas are predominant." (17). Within the third section entitled "Teachers" Cheney discussed the many distractors that keep teachers from effectively teaching their subject content as well as transmitting cultural knowledge (21, 22, 23). The final section "Recommendations" addressed the following three topics of reform: I. "More time should be devoted to the study of history, literature and foreign languages.", II. "Textbooks should be made more substantive.", and III. "Teachers should be given opportunities to become more knowledgeable about the subjects that they teach." (28).

Part II. Art Education Reform--A Summary of Toward Civilization: A Report on Arts Education, DBAE Literature and their orientations and recommendations regarding changes in curricula, teacher preparation and certification, and the role of the museum

Goodlad, John I. "What Some Schools and Classrooms Teach." Educational Leadership 40.7 (April 1983): 8-19.

In their research of 129 elementary, 362 junior high, and 525 senior high classes, author John Goodlad and colleagues sought to examine "...a great many of the commonplaces of schooling: goals, teaching practices, curricular content, school and classroom organization, materials used, problems and issues, rules and regulations..." and to see these from the varied perspectives of students, teachers, principals, and parents (8). Goodlad first discussed school goals from documents derived from every state, the four catagories these goals fall into, and the presence of both explicit and hidden curricula (10). Goodlad stated his data showed priority was given to the content areas of English and Math, however at the senior high level the emphasis of vocational education was at the expense of academic subjects (10). The body of this study reported their findings and data relating to the areas of English/Language Arts, Social Studies, Vocational Education and the Arts (11, 12, 13, 16). Regarding the visual arts Goodlad stated the goals of developing creativity and aesthetic enrichment took a remote position "to emphasis on the use of tools and on performance." and that "...there was a noticable absence of emphasis on the arts as cultural expression and artifact." (14). When commenting on the arts programs he studied, Goodlad stated "...that they go little beyond coloring, polishing, and playing..." and "What does not come through in our data is much, if any, indication that the arts were being perceived as central to personal satisfaction in a world rich in art forms, processes, and products." (14). Goodlad also commented that as long as schools are expected to work particularly on areas of reading, writing, and mathematic operations, the arts will continue to be on the fringe of school curricula (19).

Miller, Phyllis K. "Art Teacher Training Must Change!" Art Education 36.5 (Sept. 1983): 36-7.

Miller began her report by citing 3 studies: The National Assessment of Education Progress (1978-79), the Gallup Youth Survey, and her own survey of 99 college students whose findings all attested to the absence of learning about the cultural arts in visual arts programs (36). Miller stressed goals relating to the teaching of cultural appreciation are always present "Whether by state, school district, or individual school..." (36). Miller stated that "In spite of such lofty statements, there is little evidence, at least in the visual arts, that little has been done to bring the schools into compliance with these goals." (36). The author cited reasons why teachers don't address areas of art history and criticism in their classroom and related this neglect to the teacher training programs which also place little emphasis on historic or critical aspects in art (36). In addition to needed teacher training reform Miller stated "an even greater lack is the lack of methodology for teaching the subject, and that college art education facilities have failed to develop methods to make art history and criticism more relevant and palpable to young and adolescent students." (37). Another issue cited by Miller affecting teaching methods was the separation of art history from studio courses at the college level which leaves teachers unprepared to teach in an integrated more holistic manner (37). Miller cited several books which discuss a wider scope for art education including those by Eisner, Chapman, Broudy, Hurwitz and Madeja (37). Miller concluded by listing 3 changes in teacher training needed to be made if a wider scope of art education is to be achieved (37). The three recommendations are: 1) 18 hours in art history required at undergraduate level, 2) Develop art education methods courses addressing procedures for teaching aesthetics, art history, and criticism and the use of community resources such as museums, and 3) New teaching materials need to be developed and made available (37).

Greer, W. Dwaine. "Discipline-Based Art Education: Approaching Art as a Subject of Study," Studies in Art Education 25.4 (1984): 212-218.

Greer opened this article with a discussion of the basic ideas that have shaped DBAE (212). He stressed that DBAE supports the point of view of an "...understanding of art education as a discipline;" (212) and that "...discipline-based art education should produce educated adults who are knowledgeable about art and its production and respond to the aesthetic properties of works of art and other objects." (212). Greer commented that DBAE is a refutation of the "...conception of the child as a self-taught artist..." (212). Greer also acknowledged that DBAE is in a state of flux and that various aspects continue to be defined (213). Under the topic heading "Parameters of DBAE" Greer outlined the following seven definitive characteristics: 1) DBAE has focused "...on developing an understanding of art, the intrinsic value of art study, as opposed to a focus on the way art education contributes to other areas of study, which is an extrinsic justification," (214); 2) DBAE stresses the study of art and its content rather that the enjoyment of art (216); 3) DBAE develops abilities from each of the four disciplines (216); 4) DBAE requires a formal, sequenced written curriculum (216); 5) DBAE is a "comprehensive view" of art which "...provides for continuing focus on an integrated understanding of art, rather than on isolated components." (217); and 6,7) DBAE prescribes "...attention to systematic instruction with time requirements and attention to outcomes..." (217). Greer believed art education will be legitimized only when content is "rigorous" and measurable and teachers are accountable for teaching that content (217).

Getty Center for Education in the Arts. Beyond Creating: The Place for Art in America's Schools. Los Angeles, CA.: J. Paul Getty Trust, April 1985.

Since the formation of the Getty Center for Education in the Arts in 1982, the Getty Center has focused on issues central to art education (forward). To initiate their inquiry they wanted to better understand why art education has such a low status in our schools (preface). The Center noted that the findings of its research "lead Getty to conclude that if art education is to move from the sidelines of instruction to a more central place in a balanced school curriculum, its content needs to be expanded to include attention to the disciplines that contribute to understanding art..."(v). When the Getty Center chose to adopt and support the concept of Discipline-Based Art Education they acquired the research assistance of the Rand Corporation to find out whether DBAE was being practiced in any of the nation's school districts (5). Rand's research and analysis of the seven selected districts are included in this report (5). The Getty report also discussed factors in changing art education, phases involved in developing successful DBAE programs, and the comments of Dr. Ernest Boyer, Dr. William Kiechnick, and Dr. Elliot Eisner whose topics were respectively: "Art as Language: Its Place in the School", "The Signals of Art to the Workplace", and "Why Art in Education and Why Art Education"(8, 21, 28). In his address, Eisner commented on the relationship between schools and museums "...as a culture we regard the arts among the highest of human achievements: we build palaces we call museums to display the fruits of artistic inquiry....In effect, we recognize as a culture that the arts represent the apothesis of human achievement. Yet, paradoxically we provide little place for them in our schools."(29).

Zeller, Terry, "Museum Education and School Art: Different Ends and Different Means." Art Education 38.3 (May 1985): 6-10.

It was Zeller's intent "...to explore differences between art education in schools and learning in art museums, with an eye toward implications of these differences for a museum school partnership...."(7). Zeller cited differences between museums and schools and stated that as a result of the museum's unfamiliar environment "...teachers often transfer their pedagogical expectations, models of student behavior, and instructional methods from the classroom to the museum..." thereby nullifying the museum's unique learning potential by making the museum experience merely an "extension of the classroom."(7). Zeller contended that a museum-school partnership will continue on a limited basis until the schools and art teachers recognized and value the informal and individualized nature of learning from objects (7). The author also addressed art instruction reform and teacher training reform as they relate to museum education (8). Zeller stated "If art instruction is to become a part of the educational mainstream and prepare students for lifelong learning, there is an urgent need for fundamental reforms in the way art teachers are trained."(8). Zeller cited Laura Chapman's comments regarding art education reform and he stated that "Chapman's notion of the role of the art teacher has more in common with what art museum educators are doing that it does with current practices in art rooms in America's school."(8) Zeller also noted that the DBAE approach is in agreement with the goals of museum education, (9), and that DBAE trained teachers are in a better position to strengthen the school-museum partnership (10).

Kerr, Jessie Levano-. "Implications of DBAE for University Education of Teachers." Studies in Art Education 26.4 (1985): 216-23.

In her article Levano-Kerr discussed the 1965 Penn State Seminar in Art Education and the consensus that was reached regarding the definition of art education, its goals, professional models, curriculum structure and content, and how these ideas have in the last twenty years evolved into what is currently termed Discipline-Based Art Education (216, 217). The author stated that DBAE has a number of implications for art educators, however, her article focused specifically on DBAE's consequences regarding teacher training (217). Levano-Kerr suggested that art teacher preparation programs are in part responsible for the continued propagation of studio-oriented art programs (219). The National Art Education Association standards recommends thirty-nine studio hours and twelve hours in the areas of art history, aesthetics, and art criticism (220). She pointed out that teacher preparation programs are more studio dominated than the NAEA hours indicate as their standard is viewed as an "ideal" leaving teachers unprepared to teach art history, criticism, and aesthetics let alone the integration of these four disciplines as DBAE requires (220, 221). Noting that DBAE requires a "different structure for art teacher preparation" Levano-Kerr made several recommendations: that teams consisting of the four disciplines examine curricular and content issues; that courses be team taught for more integration; that art criticism and aesthetics be separate requirements independent of art history; and that as a result of added interdisciplinary courses "a fifth year of study would be necessary to obtain a bachelor's degree in art education."(221, 222). Levano-Kerr concluded by stating that "Higher education will be central to the success of any effort to improve education in the arts for all Americans." (223).

Galbraith, Lynn, and Marvin J. Spomer.. "Does Art History Go to School?" Art Education 39 (Sept. 1986): 10-13.

Because Discipline-Based Art Education has advocated the return of art history to the core of the art curricula, Galbraith and Spomer surveyed 146 secondary art teachers concerning their art history teaching practices (10). The largest group of this Midwestern sample 27 (26%) had 9-12 years teaching experience, and 32 (30.8%) had 10-15 hours undergraduate or graduate courses in art history (11). This survey found that 64 (61.1%) of the teachers introduced art history in conjunction with "creative art activities" (12). The statistics supported Chapman's previous 1979 study, and further indicated that teachers neglected to teach concepts central to art history (12). Galbraith and Spomer cited the following three factors which might be negatively influencing these teachers and curtail the inclusion of art history into their curricula: 1) "constraints of the curriculum"; 2) teacher discomfort with more traditional instructional styles, and 3) insufficient interest on the teacher's part.

MacGregor, Nancy Parker. "Aesthetic Education and Current Trends Affecting Arts Education." Journal of Aesthetic Education 20.4 (Winter 1986): 83-6.

In her article MacGregor discussed events outside the schools which affect arts education (83). Citing such examples as A Nation at Risk (1983) and the Academic Preparation for College: What Students Need to Know and Be Able to Do MacGregor stated that "The impact of the excellence movement on current trends is the call for more substance as a means to improve the quality of the arts curriculum."(83). The author discussed the CEMREL aesthetic movement through "a new kind of focus for content" (84). More recent activities related to the excellence movement have formed sponsorship with The Getty Center for Education in the Arts, and The National Endowment for the Arts (84). While these two sponsors differed in their terminology, the Getty Center espoused "discipline-based art education" and the NEA supports "making arts basic" both recognized the need for substantive, art education programs "...based on the disciplines, sequenced, and balanced between aesthetic awareness, creative artistic activity, studies of art in historical-cultural contexts, and critical study." (85). MacGregor also pointed out mutual similarities between the excellence movement and the aesthetic education movement, two of them being their shared desire to "revitalize the content and teaching of the arts." as well as to inject needed academic "rigor" (85). MacGregor stated these outside groups dedicated to improving arts education have identified needs, developed implementation strategies, and "...have the resources to carry out their implementation plans. Their impact on the present excellence movement can be significant." (86).

Getty Center For Education in the Arts. "Discipline-Based Art Education: What Forms Will It Take?" National Invitational Conferences. Los Angeles Getty Center for Education in the Arts, Jan. 1987.

This report sponsored by the Getty Center for Education in the Arts is a synopsis of its conference on DBAE (IV). In addition to "keynote speeches" by noted art educators and the U. S. Secretary of Education William J. Bennett, panel discussions topics included: "Art Production", "Art History", "Art Criticism", and "Aesthetics" (22-28); "Advocating DBAE" (56); "Components of a DBAE Program" (70); "The Role of Creativity in DBAE" (80); and "DBAE's Impact on Museum Education" (88). Panelists Norva L. Herlihy and Beth L. Cornell discussed the relationship between DBAE and museums (88). Herlihy stated that museums have a strong contribution to make to a DBAE curriculum and that "Museums can be active in the process of arts education as catalysts and planners working with schools, teachers, and art professionals...." (88). Panelists Patterson Williams, David Kamansky, and Brett Waller addressed "DBAE's Impact on Museum Education" (90, 92, 94). Kamansky acknowledged the potential of a mutually beneficial relationship between schools and museums in a DBAE program (90), and Waller stressed that "the full promise of DBAE" would become manifest with the contribution of museum expertise (91). Williams reflected on "the creation of the empowered museum visitor" as a result of DBAE's influence, and stated "...museums could wind up with a public not only larger but also truly pluralistic drawn from a broader spectrum of the social, economic, and ethnic population." (94). Regarding DBAE's potential, Williams commented "I think it [DBAE] could revolutionize the way we think and serve the public in museums." (93).

Zeller, Terry. "Museums and the Goals of Art Education." Art Education 40 (January 1987): 50-5.

In this article Zeller contended that "....not only can museum learning contribute to NAEA's goals but that it should be an integral part of all school art programs and should not be treated as enrichment, supplement, or a mere resource for the classroom art program." (50). Zeller's discussion regarding the contributions made by museums was based on the educational programs of thirty-five museums in the United States (51). The first heading "Museum-School Partnership" focused on the exemplary programs at the Philadelphia Museum, the Denver Art Museum, and the Toledo Museum of Art (51). Within "Museums and the Disciplines of Art" Zeller discussed the multi-disciplinary nature of museum programs as well as the four disciplines integral to discipline-based art education (51, 52). In the section "Museums and Professional Development" Zeller stated that museums contribute to the continuing education of teachers and cited various museum training programs (53). The section entitled "Museum Instructional Resources" cited examples of the visual resource packages offered by museums to aid teachers in integrating the four disciplines of DBAE (53). In "Museum Learning vs. Schooling" Zeller noted the unique nature of museum learning and gave particular attention to its informal and intergenerational aspects (53, 54). The final section "How to Make Museums Basic to Art Programs" was composed of twenty-five suggestions to aid teachers in integrating the museum into their curriculum (54, 55).

Clark, Gilbert A., Michael D. Day, and D. Dwaine Greer. "Discipline-based-Art Education: Becoming Students of Art." Journal of Aesthetic Education 21.2 (Summer 1987): 129-193.

Clark, Day, and Greer were commissioned by The Getty Center for Education in the Arts to write a monograph about DBAE (183). They addressed the theories and disciplines integral to DBAE, and the gradual shift and evolution of this art education reform movement during the last twenty-five years (131). An analysis of similarities and contrasts between DBAE and the Discipline-Centered Reform Movement, and DBAE and the Creative Self-Expression Approach were charted and examined (132-134). The remainder of this document was divided by the authors into sections including characteristics which define DBAE, and a discussion of each (135). The sections are as follows: 1) "Art as an Essential Subject in General Education", 2) "Art Disciplines and Art Education", 3) "Art Curricula for Art Students", and 4) "Art in Every Classroom" (136, 147, 165, 175). Regarding DBAE's relationship with museums the authors stated "As students become more advanced in their study of works of art, they should have increased access and exposures to examples of original works. Teachers are encouraged to use their communities' resources in such places as museums, galleries,..."(146) and "This need to encounter original works of art in addition to the use of reproductions in schools naturally connects DBAE with museum education." (146). Clark, Day, and Greer believed DBAE can also aid teachers and museum educators in their "complementary educational activities" (147).

Kleinbauer, W. Eugene. "Art History in Discipline-based Art Education." Journal of Aesthetic Education 21.2 (Summer 1987): 205-215.

Under the heading "Rationale for Art History in the Public School" Kleinbauer stated "Art history, the practice of art, art criticism, and aesthetics are distinct subjects that stand on their own pedagogically and that contribute significantly to education in different ways." (205). As a DBAE proponent, Kleinbauer contended that these four disciplines should comprise the basis of an arts curriculum (205). Concerning art history specifically the author stressed its importance from the standpoint of learning from the visual arts as well as literature and music, because of its focus on teaching visual literacy, and its ability to strengthen an artist's ability to produce art (206, 207, 208). Within the topic "Concepts and Skills in Art History" Kleinbauer discussed the variety of arts and crafts objects historians describe, analyze, interpret and historically assess, and intrinsic and extrinsic modes of inquiry used (208, 209). Regarding art history in the schools the author stated that secondary students should be taught art history basics as well as intrinsic and extrinsic methods (211). However Kleinbauer believed art history should not be taught as a survey course as students at this stage have an inadequate background in Western civilization (211). In the author's last topic "Art History and DBAE" he compared and contrasted art history with the three other disciplines and discussed their inter relationships (211, 212, 213).

Sevigny, Maurice. "Discipline-based Art Education and Teacher Education." Journal of Aesthetic Education 21.2 (Summer 1987): 95-121.

Sevigny's primary focus in his study was to discern DBAE's effect, if any, on teacher education programs (95). Using a computer search thirty undergraduate programs in art education were selected which qualified as having "probable relationships to the concept of DBAE." (96). This was narrowed to fourteen programs which were selected for an historical review of their program offerings since the 1960's (96). The body of Sevigny's report was divided into four parts, the first being "Art Teaching Traditions and Transitions" which traced program evolution and values between the 1930's to the 1950's (96, 97). Part two "Reservice Art Education Degree Programs and DBAE," gave an overview of the course content within art education courses for the past twenty years, including DBAE issues which influenced program requirements (102, 103). Part three "In-service Teacher Education Experiments and DBAE," focused on six in-service teacher training institutes which were designed to develop instructional competencies in the four DBAE disciplines, and the programs included were: The Stanford Kettering Project, the Aesthetic Education Curriculum Program of the Central Midwestern Regional Educational Laboratory (CEMREL), the Ohio State Art Teacher Fellowship Programs, and the Aesthetic Eye Project (110-116). In part four "Discussions and Recommendations" Sevigny discussed areas needing further clarification or development (117-121). Sevigny concluded that despite the prevalence of theories developed at art education conferences and seminars, art education programs have changed very little, and that "DBAE is at an impasse until a major redesign of teacher education courses and requirements is implemented to realize the goals of DBAE." (109). Sevigny stressed new models must be developed which connect DBAE theory to teaching applications if teachers are ever going to be enticed away from studio dominated art programs (121).

Day, Michael D. "Discipline based Art Education in Secondary Classrooms." Studies in Art Education 28.4 (1987): 234-42.

Day began his article by citing the comments of Salome (1987) regarding the lack of DBAE programs and classroom methodologies for teachers to emulate as well as the need for "data describing successful DBAE programs" and the need to "compare the achievements of students in DBAE and non-DBAE programs." (234). Although in agreement with Salome, Day contended that early studies which were essentially discipline-based should be examined (234). Day cited two of his previous studies (1969, 1976) and also referred to the study commissioned by The Getty Center of Education in the Arts (234). In Day's 1969 study the author taught a six week unit in Cubism to control and experimental groups of middle school students to determine the effects of an integrated approach (234). Day stated "Results of the study indicated that students learned critical and historical content better which it was integrated with studio activities than when it was presented in the traditional lecture-slide technique." (235). Day's 1976 study involved one hundred fifty-nine high school students in art foundations classes (237). Day and colleagues taught control and experimental groups three art history units with previously defined curricula guidelines (237). Day stated "The results of the study indicated strong effects of instruction on students' art preferences and art judgments." (237). Day concluded that DBAE programs have the potential for both wide variety and individuality and there was no evidence to support the allegation that the quality of art production will decline in a DBAE program (240, 241).

Eisner, Elliot. "The Role of Discipline-Based Art Education in America's Schools." Art Education 40 (September 1987): 6-45.

In his paper Elliot Eisner discussed at length the nature of Discipline-Based Art Education and art education in general under three broad catagories: "The Arts and the Mission of Education", "The Status of Art in the Schools", and "What is Discipline-Based Art Education?" (6, 11, 13). Within this first grouping Eisner asked if "....the arts are ornamental?" (6) and discussed the importance of effective settings for learning and the biological basis for learning (6, 7). When addressing the function of the arts in the schools Eisner stressed that "...the curriculum of the school is aimed--or should be aimed--at the development of multiple forms of literacy, the kinds of perceptual and problem solving skills fostered by effective art programs" (9). Within his second category "The Status of Art in the Schools" the author discussed how our culture regards and makes distinctions between art, mind, talent, and intelligence, and how this all relates to art's marginal position in the schools (11, 12, 13). His third and most lengthy category "What is Discipline-Based Art Education?" examines the four following assumptions in DBAE: "Children develop not only from inside out, but from the outside in" (14), "The acquisition of artistic skills in the making and perception of art are complex and subtle in character" (14), "....learning in art is related to the course of human development." (14), and ".....curricular tasks that children are asked to engage in must have meaning to them: intrinsic not simply extrinsic meaning." (15). Eisner also commented on the aims and content of DBAE and its four disciplines in learning in art, the objectives, alternative curricula structures of DBAE, and the role of evaluation in DBAE (16-22). Eisner concluded that a case for Discipline-Based Art Education is also a case for "the development of the mind." (45).

Hamblen, Karen. "An Examination of Discipline-based Art Education Issues." Studies in Art Education 28.2 (1987): 68-78.

Hamblen's stated purpose was to examine Discipline-Based Art Education issues for their "origins, meanings, and implications." and she discussed these issues within the four general catagories of: "conceptual structure, curriculum selection, research foundations, and organizational affiliations." (68). The author believed that DBAE issues and theories correlate with the ideas of academic rationalism and technocratic rationalism because of their reliance upon academic experts, standardized content, efficiency of means, and pre-defined outcomes (69). Hamblen traced DBAE origins back to Barkans (1966) educational model and Greer's writing which cited three central components of DBAE: 1) "DBAE consists of integrated instruction comprising the four areas of aesthetics, studio production, art history, and art criticism; 2) instruction is sequenced from simple to complex with sophisticated professional behaviors serving as prototypical instructional outcomes; 3) written curriculum is necessary and instruction is systematic across grade levels." (69). Within the first category of "conceptual structure" Hamblen addressed such problem areas as: identifying and sequencing content, role modeling, and aesthetics as a questionable area of study (70,71). In the category of "curriculum selection" Hamblen addressed DBAE's predominately western, upper middle-class orientation, its limitations with aesthetic scanning as the only criticism approach, and DBAE's focus on elementary level instruction (72). The third category "research foundations" compared "Programmatic versus Generative Approaches" as they relate to DBAE, and individual differences as they relate to students of DBAE (73). Hamblen's last category included a discussion of its linkage with The Getty Center for Education in the Arts, and the lack of any critical dialogue relating to DBAE (75, 76).

Hamblen, Karen. "What Does DBAE Teach?" Art Education 42 (March 1988): 23-35.

The author Karen Hamblen stated that "DBAE is undoubtedly the most discussed and written about perspective in art education at this time" (23). The focus of her paper was that DBAE teaches through the basic nature of its characteristics, and assumptions (23). Hamblen suggested that "...as more DBAE programs are implemented, evaluative measures need to be focused not only on observable learning goals, but also on the larger scope of attitudes, values, and meanings that are subtly and powerfully shaped by the character of the curricula itself." (23). The majority of her paper discussed the characteristics of DBAE, and pointed out what the author believed are limitations in the DBAE programs such as its emphasis on Western fine art and the repercussions of teaching highly simplified and testable art content (26). Hamblen stated "It is unfortunate that the curricular model chosen by major DBAE proponents has received the most attention in the literature, and that its characteristics are presented as the way DBAE should be interpreted." (35). She concluded that this most common model of DBAE should be considered as only one of many possible DBAE models (35).

Toward Civilization: A Report on Arts Education. Washington D. C.: National Endowment for the Arts. May. 1988.

This report began by asking and defining "What is Basic Arts Education?" and continued by stating that "The problem is: basic arts education does not exist in the United States today." (13). The majority of this study addressed "The State of Arts Education Today" and was divided into six sections (19). Section I "Towards an Arts Curriculum" discussed problems relating to curriculum guides, and issues relevant to art curriculum as well as recommendations (75, 81, 89). Section II "The Case for Testing and Evaluation in the Arts" addressed problems inherent in student evaluation in the arts, pros and cons regarding testing, and recommendations (91, 96, 100). Section III "Teachers of the Arts" discussed the status and scarcity of the art specialist at the elementary level, teacher certification standards, teacher reform, and recommendations (101, 105, 108, 113). Section IV "Research Priorities in Arts Education" dealt with citing reasons why there is so little art education research, existing types of research, federal assistance available for arts education research, and recommendations (117, 118, 121, 123). Section V "Leadership in Arts Education" included four subtopics: the "Governance Sector", Arts Sector", "Education Sector", and the "Business-Producer Sector" (126, 132, 146, 157). Section VI entitled "The Role of the National Endowment for the Arts" outlined the "Arts in Education Program", "Discipline Programs", and "Evaluation of Endowment Efforts" (161, 164, 167).

Smoke, Jerry. "Art History and Aesthetics in the Secondary School." In Research Readings for Discipline-based Art Education: A Journey Beyond Creating. Ed. Mark Dobbs. Los Angeles, CA: The National Art Education Association, 1988.

Smoke began this essay with a discussion of art appreciation, art history, and aesthetics methodologies and emphasized that teachers in these areas should be helping students clarify their own values about art objects (70). Smoke suggested that teachers are uncomfortable with teaching art history and theory because they have never confronted or understood their own "value system" (71). Smoke stressed "When students understand and can use some methodology to support their own opinions in art, the art teachers will be able to say that they are teaching art history and are providing the tools to help students support their own attitudes and values." (73). The author acknowledged that while aesthetics is not usually present in secondary school art curricula "....it can provide the necessary foundation and links for making art history an interest subject for students" (73). Smoke also discussed two models of "aesthetic inquiry", one developed by David Ecker and Eugene Kaelin, and the second by Gene Mittler both of which "....build from the work itself and allows students the freedom to exercise their perceptual and value systems." (73,74).

Wilson, Brent. "Art Criticism As Writing As Well As Talking." In Research Readings for Discipline-based Art Education: A Journey Beyond Creating. Ed. Mark Dobbs. Los Angeles: The National Art Education Association, 1988.

Wilson revealed a number of questions and issues relevant to the teaching of art criticism, and sought to discover if there was a relationship between studio art and the way students interpret art (137). After analyzing 16,422 responses of fifth, seventh, ninth, and eleventh grade students he concluded "that there were hardly any changes in critical writing about works of art between the fifth and eleventh grades (even though the students received a minimum of four semesters of art instruction between these grades)." (137). Wilson also included two studies by the national Assessment pertaining to students' critical responses (139), his own 1970 research dealing with the extent to which art teachers have the necessary skills to teach art criticism (140, 141), two studies analyzing the effects of two different critical models on the writings of students (141, 142), and a comprehensive study in the Virginia Beach Schools addressing "the effects of a long term program of art criticism (142).

Part III A review of museum education literature, the role of the museum educator within the museum staff, and the museum-school relationship.

Newson, Barbara, and Adele Silver. The Art Museum as Educator. Beckley: University of California Press, 1978.

The Art Museum as Educator was a project supported by grants from the National Endowment for the Arts, and the National Endowment for the Humanities as well as from private foundations (preface). Authors Newsom and Silvers compiled 103 studies of 105 museum education programs from 71 institutions in the United States, and stated that their purpose for this massive inquiry was "...to give both educators and policymakers a realistic picture of what museums are doing, and perhaps, what is possible for them to do." (preface). Newson and Silver perceived this project "...as one stage in the development of a body of literature about museum education." (preface). The only precedent for this study was The Art Museum Comes to the School (1944) by Lydia Bond Powel (preface). The case studies were divided into three parts by audience: 1) "The AA Museum and Its General Public", 2) "The Art Museum and the Young, Their Teachers, and Their Schools", and 3) "The Art Museum and Its College, University and Professional Audience", and into fifteen chapters which addressed a particular issue pertaining to that audience (forward). Regarding the museum's role as an educator the authors pointed out that the museum is the primary source for visual education (21) and "Just as there is no definitive profile of the museum's public, so there is no single or consistent art museum view of how best to educate them." (78).. Newson and Silver stressed that although museum educators had no consensus on educational methodology they were in agreement that visual education in the public schools is at best inadequate (466) and that as museum educators they had more to offer art teachers than they had to learn from them (466). According to the authors the desire to improve secondary art instruction through the development of museum-school programs has had a long and unsuccessful history primarily because "...art has been deemed useless for students going straight to work after high school and unnecessary for students preparing for college..." (400), because of a lack of flexible scheduling (403), and because of a lack of understanding and cooperation between these two institutions (467). Silvers commented on this mutual ignorance "It is a rare teacher who knows the museum, perhaps, but it seems to be a rarer museum educator who knows the schools." (467).

Commission on Museums for a New Century. Museums for a New Century. Washington D. C.: American Association of Museums, 1984.

The Commission of Museums for a New Century made up of museum directors, trustees, and business leaders had three objectives: "....to explore current social, economic, political and scientific trends that will affect the future of museums; to identify trends in the operations and needs of museum; and to describe the resulting opportunities and responsibilities facing the museum community." (11) The body of this document consisted of the following seven chapters: Chapter I "The Growing Museum Movement" discussed museum attendance statistics and demographic trends (19, 25, 28). Chapter II "Stewards of a Common Wealth" focused on curatorship, collections, and their conservation (35-37, 40). Chapter III "A New Imperative for Learning" centered on education and the museum, the nature of museum learning, and outreach programs (55-59, 64). Chapter IV "The Guiding Values of Museums" addressed museum associations, accreditation, and the role of docents (76, 78). Chapter V "The Collaborative Spirit" focused on various types of collaboration, international partnerships, and joint educational programs (91, 94). Chapter VI "From Private Appreciation to Public Awareness" discussed the marketing of museums to increase public awareness and attendance (99-101). Chapter VII "The Economic Picture: A Joint Venture: addressed fund raising, charitable deductions, and the arts marketplace (109, 112). The Commission also included sixteen recommendations they stated were collective "suggestions for action" (12). This document was not only a self examination of the museum community, but it included those people and institutions which could aid museum professionals in more fully attaining their mission (12).

Goodman, Nelson, "The End of the Museum?" Journal of Aesthetic Education 19.2 (Summer 1985): 53-62.

In this essay which was also an address at the annual meeting of the Association of American Museums, Goodman compared libraries and museums while addressing the museum's mission saying both "....collect and preserve works and make them available for public use." (53, 55), and that "Libraries and museums are fundamentally educational rather than recreational institutions." (56). Goodman also cited differences between these institutions that museums unlike libraries have to teach their patrons to become visually literate and that conditions for aesthetically enjoying works of art are "at best abnormal and adverse." (56, 57). The author continued "The museum has to function as an institution for the prevention and cure of blindness in order to make works work. And making works work is the museums major mission." (56). Making "works work" is according to the author "transforming" in nature and that "works work when by stimulating inquisitive looking, sharpening, perception, raising visual intelligence, widening perspectives, bringing out new connections and contrasts...they participate in the organization and reorganization of experience...." (56). Goodman believed museums fail to attain their main purpose because of curatorial and security concerns create a hostile environment (58). Goodman concluded by discussing the difficulties involved in evaluating the "cultural health" of a community and stressed to museum professional that "....cooperation between research and practice is as much needed in making works work as in making crops grow...." (62).

Luckett, Helen. "Ten Years of Gallery Education." Journal of Aesthetic Education. 19.2 (Summer 1985): 125-42.

Helen Luckett, Art Education Officer of the Arts Council of Great Britain discussed aspects relating to the state of museum education (125). She noted that museums in Great Britain have considered education an important function since the mid-nineteenth century and "that galleries had a special educational responsibility precisely because very little teaching of art appreciation was being undertaken in the he schools. And the indication was that very little would be possible in the future as few teachers are equipped to teach appreciation because it demands a wider knowledge of art than is yet provided in the majority of training colleges." (126). Regarding curriculum reform in Great Britain Luckett stated "the rethinking of the art and design curriculum has made it likely that critical studies--the new term for art appreciation--will become an important and inescapable element. This has direct implications for gallery education." (127). Luckett also discussed the opinions of gallery directors relating to education's place within the museum and the low esteem they have for museum education and educators (129). Regarding the issue of "outreach" and audience development Luckett noted "...few galleries have an active commitment to building new audiences. Too many curators are prepared to accept that fine art appeals to 'a very tiny minority of people' and that it is only of interest and significance to an educated, middle class public." (130,131). Luckett addressed the lack of visual literacy in her culture saying: "The pleasure of looking seems permanently underrated, at least in England, compared with those of reading and listening to music." (132). The author concluded by stressing that schools should be encouraged to make more use of museums and should expect more of them, and in turn museums should attempt to attract a wider audience and re-evaluate their goals and attitudes where the public is concerned (141).

Muhlberger, Richard. "After Art History, What? A Personal View of the Shaping of Art Museum Education." Journal of Aesthetic Education 19.2 (Summer 1985): 93-103.

The author of this article stated that the field of museum education is undergoing many changes and "...has expanded to encompass much more than the history of art." (93). Muhlberger believed that museum learning is dependent on and shaped by the museum object and the museum audience (93). Regarding current educational reform Muhlberger commented "As public demands for higher achievement in elementary and secondary education increase, the art museum is proving itself one of the few institutions ready to assist in meeting the challenge. Enlightened art educators in public education who attempt to change from the old single-emphasis, studio-oriented teaching of art to a broader approach....find the museum educator the only possible partner in their endeavor to reach this goal." (93). Throughout this article the author discussed his experiences as a museum educator for eighteen years, and differences between museum learning and classroom learning (93, 95). Concerning the professional training of museum educators Muhlberger stated that "Art history provides the common language of art museums....But an art museum, by its very nature, embraces more than one point of view....so, if art history is the primary language, what else is spoken?" (97). Muhlberger contended that the narrow focus on art history put the museum educator "adrift in foreign waters" whenever they attempted anything beyond art history lectures (97). Muhlberger concluded with a look forward into the future of museum education and cited two critical factors: "...the profession itself mounting initiatives that will upgrade the qualifications of fledgling museum educators, and the increased interaction between art museum educators, curators, registrars, conservators, directors, and artists to provide avenues whereby both people and art will be better served by the art museums of America" (103).

Williams, Patterson B. "Educational Excellence in Art Museums: An Agenda for Reform." Journal of Aesthetic Education 19.2 (Summer 1985): 105-23.

Williams, the Director of Education at the Denver Art Museum addressed what she considered to be three factors of the "museum education problem": 1) that the educational needs of the public are secondary in museums (106), 2) that museum professionals work against one another (107), and 3) the confusion of values among museum staff (106). The body of this article consisted of three topics, the first being "National Education Reform and Some Implications for Museums" (108). Within this heading Williams discussed peak periods in the history of museum education reform, and the implications raised by two education reform reports A Nation at Risk (1983) and The Paideia Proposal (1982) (108, 109). The second topic "Museum Education from a National Perspective" summarized the American Art Association of Museums' nationwide study "Museums for a New Century" (1984) and provided a selection of the commission's sixteen recommendations (111). In the final section "Excellence in Education in Art Museums: An Agenda for Action" Williams suggests two nation-level actions to increase educational excellence in museums and discussed the following five areas in museum operations most likely to produce educational excellence: 1) "Value-driven educational leadership", 2) "Educational expertise and its role within the museum organization", 3) "Mastery-level teaching in museums", 4) "Using educational multipliers", and 5) "Research in visitor education". (115, 116, 117, 118, 120). Williams concluded that the negation of the educational problem will create an "empowered" museum visitor (122).

Dobbs, Stephen M., and Elliot W. Eisner. The Uncertain Profession: Observations on the State of Museum Education in Twenty American Art Museums. Los Angeles, CA: Getty Center for Education in the Arts. 1986.

Authors Dobbs and Eisner conducted this study on behalf of The Getty Center for the Arts which itself has a vested interest in promoting dialogue relating to the appreciation of works of art due to its Discipline-Based Art Education orientation (forward). Their research focused on the attitudes and opinions of thirty-eight museum directors and museum education department heads in twenty medium to large sized museums in the United States regarding problems and issues central to the museum educator (3). Dobbs and Eisner organized their research into three components (4). Part I. was an explanation of the authors' goals and methods regarding this endeavor (4). Part II. consisted of discussion addressing the six following areas: 1: "The Mission of Museum Education", 2) "The Status and Role of Museum Educators", 3) Professional Preparation for Museum Education", 4) "Program Resources for Museum Education", 5) "Research and Evaluation in Museum Education", and 6) "Museum Education and the Community" (6, 20, 29, 46, 57, 64). Part III. listed the authors' eight recommendations which centered on how the potential of museum education could be more fully realized (5).

W. K. Kellogg Foundation. Open Conversations: Strategies for Professional Development in Museums. Chicago: Dept. of Educ., Field Museum of Natural History, 1988.

The Kellogg Project's purpose was the assessment of: 1) "the strengths of our institutions and departments;" 2) "the unique possibilities inherent in our collections;" 3) "the interests and abilities of our visitors;" and 4) "the expertise and responsibility of our staff." (XV). The authors stated that this study "...aims not to provide definitive answers, but to offer a means by which readers may find the answers that work for them--a guide for thoughtful conversation." (XV). Section I "Institutional Mission" discussed the nature of this "statement of purpose" and how "the interpretation and implementation of the museum mission are at the heart of many institutional conflicts." (3, 4). Section II "The Unique Potential of Museums" addressed "what constitutes a 'real object', how objects communicate, and how they are meaningful", how an object's value affects the meaning which is given to that object, and the "unique educational potential" inherent in "real objects" (16, 17, 19). Chapter III "The Focus on Audience" discussed the museum's growing emphasis on the audience, factors that shape a viewer's perceptions and "visitor experience" and the nature of museum learning (39,40). Section IV "Describing our Audience" listed types of "audience description" and how these descriptions directly influence museum goals relating to "visitor experience" (49, 50). The topic of "Clarifying a Personal Philosophy" discussed in Section V emphasized how a concise "personal philosophy of museum education" is necessary if "values and assumptions of staff" relating to "subject matter", "professional commitments", and "attitudes about visitors and education" are to be understood (67, 68, 69). Section VI "Goal Setting and Role Clarification" discussed the importance of teamwork with a specialized staff to develop and implement goals and objectives, the characteristics defining a team, and models for team leadership (76, 77). Section VII "Evaluation for Decision-making" pursued types of evaluation used by museums and the types of information these evaluations generate, and their effect upon management decision making (85, 87).

Summary

Part I. Public Education and Reforms Dealing With Cultural Aspects of Education

Mortimer Adler (1982) author of The Paideia Proposal "on behalf of the members of the Paideia Group" stated "We are all victims of a school system that has only gone halfway along the road to realize the promise of democracy." (4). Regarding the importance of the educational challenges ahead Adler said "But we cannot fail without disastrous consequences for all of us. For the proper working of our political institutions, for the efficiency of our industries and businesses, for the salvation of our economy, for the vitality of our culture, and especially our future citizens--our children--we must succeed." (1982:4).

As chairman of the National Endowment for the Humanities, Linda Cheney (1987) convened a group of educators in the areas of history, literature, and foreign language to evaluate the state of humanities education in the U. S. (forward). Their consensus was that the decline in cultural literacy was due in part to the schools, and "...they agreed that there is a reason for serous concern about humanities education in U. S. schools." (forward).

Adler (1982) and the Paideia Group viewed education as "...a lifelong process of which schooling is only a small but necessary part." (10), and that schooling "...forms the habit of learning and provides the means for continuing to learn after all schooling is completed." (10). Adler (1982) also believed that the words "democracy" and "education"

must be united, and that the ideal that a democratic society must provide "...equal educational opportunities is worse than a broken promise. It is an ideal betrayed." (5).

Adler (1982) contended if education is ever to become truly democratic, fundamental changes in curricula reform and teacher training will have to take place (21, 60). He maintained that the current multi-tracking curricular structure must cease because of its discriminatory nature (15), and that "We must end that hypocrisy in our national life. We cannot say out of one side of our mouth that we are for democracy and all its fee institutions including, preeminently, political and civil liberty for all; and out of the other side of our mouth say that only some of the children fewer than half are educable for full citizenship and a full human life." (7). Adler (1982) and the Paideia Group concluded that this "same course of study for all" must be "liberal and general", "non-specialized and non-vocational", and that all electives and specialized courses should be eliminated with the single exception of "a second language" (18, 21).

In addition to these curricular reforms, Adler (1982) and colleagues defined three content areas "....of subject matter indispensable to basic schooling--language, literature, and fine arts; mathematics and natural sciences; history, geography, and social studies." (23, 24). The author stressed that a lacking in any of these areas would result in incomplete learning, and that these areas

"...provide the learner with indispensable knowledge about nature and culture, the world in which we live, our social institutions, and ourselves." (24).

Cheney (1987) echoed Adler and the Paideia Group's call for a general, non-specialized curricula by stressing that intellectual training must again become more important than skill training (7). Cheney (1987) advocated a return to the emphasis placed on cultural content by the Committee of Ten and a shift away from vocational and process oriented learning (7, 8, 9, 10). She maintained a process-content imbalance has taught our students precious little of their own heritage and culture, and that knowing how to access information is no substitute for the understanding that comes with content knowledge. (8). Cheney (1987) also recommended more curricula time be devoted to the content areas of history, literature, and foreign language (24).

Both Adler (1982) and Cheney (1987) addressed reforms in teacher preparation as a necessary element in educational reform. Adler (1982) stressed that the quality of teaching that goes on in the classroom is "the heart of the matter" (45), and "The role of the teacher is the key to the entire reform..." (84). Regarding teacher training Adler (1982) stated "The present teacher training progra- turn out persons who are not sufficiently equipped with the knowledge, the intellectual skills, or the developed understanding needed to guide and help the young in the course of study we have recommended." (60). He recommended

that colleges like basic schooling must be non-specialized, liberal, and humanistic where "...the major course of study offered is common to all," and that specialized training should exist only at the graduate level for teacher preparation (71).

Cheney (1987) indicated "Teachers should be given opportunities to become more knowledgeable about the content they teach (26), and that higher education liberal arts faculty should assume more responsibility for the continuing education of teachers (26). She also cited unnecessary fluff education courses as an impediment to adequate teacher preparation (25).

Both of these educational reformers believe our culture and democratic institutions are in peril because of the schools. Cheney's title American Memory: A Report on the Humanities in the Nation's Public Schools (1987) implies a cultural loss of memory as to who we are and what we believe in, and she emphasized that the schools have done little "...to make our children shareholders in their cultural heritage." (17). Adler (1982) professed that as citizens we should "...be alarmed by the prospects of a democracy in which a declining proportion of the people vote or endeavor to understand the great issues of our time." (xii), and that basic schooling must be improved "to preserve our free institutions." (77).

Part II. Art Education Reform Movements Sponsored by The National Endowment For the Arts And The Getty Center For Education In The Arts

As concern about cultural aspects of education has grown, there are arts reformers who have seen connections between basic arts education reform and its potential contribution to educational reform and the excellence movement in general (MacGregor 1987:84). MacGregor (1987) stated "Activities and shifts in policy designed to improve arts education can be found in recent activities related to the excellence movement. Examples are found at The Getty Center for Education in the Arts,..." (84), and "The NEA and the Getty Center, for example, have the resources to carry out their implementation plans. Their impact on the present excellence movement can be significant." (96).

Toward Civilization: A Report on Arts Education (1988) was sponsored by the NEA and mandated by Congress which "...made it clear that cultural, not economic welfare is the concern..." (1). The NEA also gave its endorsement to Cheney's report American Memory (1987) and stressed that there was agreement in the conclusions drawn by both reports. In Toward Civilization (1988) the NEA supported "basic arts education" and contended that making the arts basic for all students is essential to the achievement of cultural literacy (13), and cited "...four reasons why the arts are important: to understand civilization, to develop creativity, and to learn the tools of communication, and to develop the capacity for making wise choices among the products of art." (14). The NEA defined "basic arts

education" as including the disciplines of literature, visual art, performing arts, and media arts and "....must be taught sequentially by qualified teachers; instruction must include the history, critical theory, and ideas of the arts as well as creation, production, and performance; and knowledge of, and skills in the arts must be tested." (1988:13).

In its assessment of "the state of arts education and humanities education" the Toward Civilization (1988) report concluded that "...basic arts education does not exist in the United States today." (13). According to its authors the implementation of basic arts education begins with among other aspects, curricula reform and teacher training.(14, 101).

Regarding curricula issues the NEA reported that there is no agreement among art educators as to what content should be taught in the visual arts, that there is a disparity between what is stated in educational goals and what is in reality taught, and that no balance exists between the art disciplines of art history, criticism, and production in our nation's art classes (1988:14, 16). This sentiment was echoed by Goodlad (1983) in his earlier study of curricula content in the arts. Goodlad (1983) stated "The gap between the rhetoric of individual flexibility, originality, and creativity in our statements of educational goals and the cultivation of these in our schools reveals a monstrous hypocrisy." (17), that "...these transcendent goals took secondary position--a remote secondary position--

to emphasis on the use of tools and on performance." (14), and that "....there was a noticeable absence of emphasis on the arts as cultural expression and artifact."(14).

Several of the recommendations made by the NEA staff to achieve a sequential "basic arts education" for all students K-12 were: 1) state education agencies should be responsible for establishing minimum proficiency skills and content knowledge; 2) that education in the visual arts should consist of art history, criticism, production, cultural studies, and visual vocabulary; 3) that "state education agencies and school districts should engage knowledgeable experts to coordinate arts curriculum development and evaluation." and that these experts make use of local resources such as museums and galleries; and 4) that student evaluation is necessary in content and performance area (1988: 35, 36).

Besides a simplistic, narrow curricular approach, art teachers and the training they receive are also at the heart of art education reform according to the Toward Civilization (1988) authors (101). The NEA maintained that "Certification requirements and staffing practices are different for general classroom teachers and specialists, and vary from state to state, between elementary and secondary schools, and among art disciplines." (101). The report also stated that art generalist's requirements are inadequate to effectively teach art, and that art specialists are not prepared to teach basic arts with the studio, skill dominated training they receive (101). Miller (1983)

concurred saying that teacher preparation programs "...place little emphasis on teaching about the cultural or critical domain in art." (36).

Recommendations cited by the NEA staff addressing teacher preparation were: 1) that K-12 specialists must complete courses in art history, criticism, and aesthetics; 2) that state agencies should strengthen and standardize certification requirements for arts teachers; and 3) that states should mandate teacher competency examinations (113, 114). In addition Miller (1983) suggested "Courses should be introduced on procedures for the teaching of aesthetics, art history, and art criticism....These courses should also put emphasis on utilization of community art resources such as museums, galleries, and local artists." (37).

In addition to reforms in art education sponsored by the National Endowment for the Arts, the Getty Center for Education in the Arts and its promotion of Discipline-based Art Education also has significant potential to increase and enrich art education content as well as contribute to the larger excellence movement (MacGregor 1978: 84, 96). In reference to DBAE Dobbs (1988) stated "This alternative framework for art education, twenty years or more in the making, is today considered a leading force for change in the field, affecting concept and practice throughout the K-12 system. Its consequences for curriculum, instructional support materials, evaluation, and teacher preparation are yet to be fully realized." (7). According to Greer (1984)

DBAE is not only an art reform movement but in a sense legitimizes art as a subject of serious instruction because of its emphasis on an expanded and "rigorous" content which is described in terms of "increasing competency rather than enjoyment," (12). DBAE then, represents "a major shift in theory and practice" and its orientation makes art education a discipline in its own right with content taught and learned like other courses in general education (Clark, Day, and Greer 1987: 130, 131).

Clark, Day and Greer (1987) in their comparison of DBAE with previous art education theories stated that DBAE was a refutation of the "creative self-expression approach to art education that has dominated the field for 40 years.", and has traditionally conceived the student as a self-taught artist needing "nurture rather than instruction" (133, 134). In contrast these authors emphasized DBAE perceives the child as a student of art and requires the study of art content derived from the "four disciplines of art" (133, 134).

Although Greer (1984) noted aspects of DBAE continue to evolve and be re-defined (114), Clark, Day and Greer (1987) outlined the following ten "defining characteristics" of a DBAE program (135): 1) "The goal of discipline-based art education is to develop student's abilities to understand and appreciate art. This involves a knowledge of the theories and contexts of art and abilities to respond to as well as to create art." (135). The authors pointed out that

historically art education goals have had such diverse purposes separate from the art field as teaching morality, and psychological, and social development (138). Clark, Day and Greer (1987) stressed the difference in DBAE's orientation is a focus only on visual art content, independent of any subjects or disciplines outside of the field of art (138). 2) "Art is taught as an essential component of general education and as a foundation for specialized study." (Clark, Day, and Greer 1987:138). Regarding this characteristic, they maintained "A fundamental premise of this paper is that general education, to be balanced and complete, must attend to all major domains of human experience, including the aesthetic domain." (1987:139). These authors added that DBAE also functions within the context of general education as well as beyond general education as a subject for specialized study (1987:146). Clark, Day, and Greer (1987) believed "Advanced study of works of art should lead to connections with institutions and individuals outside the schools who are professionally involved with art.", and that students require access and exposure to examples of "original works." (146). 3) "Content for instruction is derived primarily from the disciplines of aesthetics, art criticism, art history, and art production." (147). 4) "Content for study is derived from a broad range of the visual arts including folk, applied, and fine arts from Western and non-Western cultures and from ancient to contemporary times." (163). 5)

"Curricula are written with sequentially organized and articulated content at all grade levels." (165). 6) "Works of art are central to the organization of curricula and to the integration of content from the disciplines." (169). The authors asserted that "placing works of art at the center of DBAE provides a natural means for integrating learning from the four disciplines.", and that this integration involves an understanding of the "artist as creator of the work", "the critic as explicator of the work,", "the historian as one who reveals a work's context and meaning,", and "the aesthetician as inquirer into the nature of concepts associated with works of art." (170). 7) "Curricula are structured to reflect comparable concern and respect for each of the four disciplines." (171). 8) "Curricula are organized to increase student learning and understanding. This involves a recognition of appropriate developmental levels." (174). 9) "Full implementation is marked by systematic, regular art instruction on a district-wide basis, art education expertise, administrative support, and adequate resources." (175). 10) "Student achievement and program effectiveness are confirmed by appropriate evaluation criteria and procedures." (179).

DBAE's ten defining characteristics make clear its proponents' resolve to reform art curriculum by broadening its scope. With this curricular shift the Getty Center for Education in the Arts hopes to change the value placed on art in education (Getty Center for Education in the Arts

1985:6). Although much of the "what" of DBAE theory has been resolved, there are curricular issues that remain unresolved (Hamblen 1987:70). Hamblen (1987) concluded that early in the formation of DBAE its supporters had made the assumption that a consensus could be reached regarding "identifying and sequencing" content, and that they "greatly underestimated the difficulties entailed in getting scholars in the arts and humanities to agree upon what these structures were..." (70).

Hamblen (1987) referred to one aspect of the curricula problem as the "debatable issue" of whether aesthetics should be included as one of the art's disciplines (71). She stated "The area of aesthetics may be the most troublesome for DBAE specifically because it eludes the search for a definitive content that can be given to students.", and that "....of the four art areas, aesthetics is the least developed." (71).

Another curricular area involves the selection of discipline based content, and as Hamblen (1987) pointed out DBAE creators chose the perspective of a "Western world view" with "fine arts predominating over other art types such as crafts, commercial art, and folk art" which have a "problematic aesthetic status" (72). The question of what works of art and artists are worthy of study in a DBAE program has shown DBAE's focus to be one of "art in established traditions" with a white upper-middle class museum-going orientation, and Hamblen (1987) questioned if

this was desirable in lieu of the values this society has traditionally placed on its pluralism and ethnic diversity (72).

Where DBAE content is concerned, Hamblen (1988) also questioned where the required balance between art history, criticism, production, and aesthetics was and how this balance could be achieved (32). The author addressed another DBAE quandry regarding the repercussions and value of teaching simplified, testable, and "teacher-proof" art content geared for the untrained elementary classroom teacher (Hamblen 1988:34), by stating "...that art education is currently involved in a dangerous tradeoff that may give art legitimacy but will in the process eviscerate what makes art study valuable." (Hamblen 1987:73).

Although curricular issues remain, DBAE studies have addressed art content development in particular. A content related study by Galbraith and Spomer (1986) focused on art history and its place in secondary schools (10). Galbraith and Spomer (1986) stated that their objective was to survey "...selected art teachers about their teaching practices related to art history." (10). The authors data revealed that although the responding teachers had taken some art history and criticism courses despite their studio dominated training, they were for the most part unable to teach art history's fundamental concepts (12). Art history was instead, most commonly used as a connection with studio activities (12). Galbraith and Spomer (1986) concluded that

art history "...is still being neglected in today's secondary schools..." (13), and that teachers need assistance with designing art history curricula" and in selecting teaching methodologies (13). The authors also recommended that universities should do more to train teachers in a wider more "comprehensive" understanding of art (13).

Wilson's (1986) study dealing with curriculum reform addressed issues relevant to the teaching of criticism (134). His findings support the DBAE notion that "...a critical eye is not an automatic consequence of most art instruction..." (134). The authors data consisted of student responses to paintings through the use of twenty-eight "response classifications" (134). Wilson's findings suggest the following: 1) "...students' abilities to write insightfully and sensitively about art have generally not been positively affected by art instruction (usually because art criticism is seldom an instructional topic);" 2) that art teachers lack a rudimentary understanding of art criticism concepts; 3) "...that art teachers frequently appear to be unable to provide adequate critical models for their students..."; and 4) "...that students can make enormous leaps in their critical writing when provided with adequate critical models, or with consistent instruction in criticism." (143, 144). Wilson (1986) also contended that to teach art criticism in the schools the way it would be taught would require "drastic changes in art education.",

as well as a major shift in teaching methodologies and content (144).

Day's (1987) study focused on "...ways to integrate studio art activities with critical and, especially historical art learning and to evaluate the outcomes in terms of a written test with verbal and visual items." (235). Day (1987) and colleagues taught a six week unit on Cubism to control and experimental groups of eighth graders (235). The author discussed the phases of Cubist content covered in the instruction and interdisciplinary methodologies he employed (235). Day (1987) concluded "Results of the study indicated that students learned critical and historical content better when it was integrated with studio activities than when it was presented in the traditional lecture-slide technique (235). In a following study Day (1987) investigated the effects of an integrated approach on 159 high school level students (237). The author and colleagues taught the control groups. Student activities in Day's (1987) "experimental curricula" consisted of: slides, filmstrips and movies pertaining to the historical aspects of the art style students were studying; class discussions regarding the aesthetic concepts relevant to that art style; and "...studio activities based on visual aesthetic concepts exemplified within the style they studied." (237). Day (1987) concluded "The results of the study indicated strong effects of instruction on students' art preferences and art

judgments. Students' attitudes changed positively toward art styles that they studied and these changes appeared to be reinforced with time according to a follow-up assessment two months later." (237), and "The findings of the earlier junior high study were reinforced with respect to high school students' responses to the integrated instructional approach." (237).

While art education reform movements sponsored by The National Endowment for the Arts and The Getty Center for Education in the Arts have made great strides in developing curricular theory, it is significant to note that discrepancies exist between their theory and current practices in the classroom (Lovano-Kerr 1985-:219). Lovano-Kerr (1985) maintained that art instruction is primarily studio/performance oriented and lags far behind Discipline-based art education theory (219). Miller (1983) cited various State Board of Education goals in accord with DBAE theory such as: "Appreciation of Culture, Language, and Life-style and Diversities and their Corresponding Aesthetic Values.", and stated "In spite of such lofty statements, there is little evidence, at least in the visual arts, that little has been done to bring schools into compliance with the goals." (36).

Regarding reasons for art teacher's reluctance to expand art content beyond the realm of studio production, Miller (1983) said that art teachers "...had not found a way to teach art history that held the student's interest..."

(36). Gailbraith and Spomer (1986) concluded that three factors were primary influences in determining the art teacher's decision in teaching in areas of art history and criticism (13). The first factor they listed was "the external constraints of the curriculum" such as "curriculum guidelines, inappropriateness for their grade levels, and lack of classtime..." (13). The authors' second factor involved the difference in "instructional styles" and that teachers were unfamiliar and uncomfortable "...with teaching processes involved in teaching art history, and its appreciative aspects." (13). Third, Gailbraith and Spomer (1986) suggested that art teachers are simply not interested in teaching an art historical program and see little value in teaching this content to their students (13). The authors contended that these teachers took art history courses as graduation requirements "...but also knowing that they would not be responsible for teaching such content when they finally entered teaching." (13).

Smoke (1986) in his observations of student teachers stressed that "Without exception they all experienced the most difficulty teaching their classes when it came to the academic side of art, that is, history and theory." (71), and that even when content deficiencies were overcome it was apparent that these intern teachers had never had to come to terms with their own "value system" as students themselves and were as a result unable to address their students' "value laden questions" in the classroom (71). Smoke (1986)

contended that until teachers relate to the "how" of art history instead of the memorization of artists, titles, and dates students will never be able to understand or support their own opinions in art (73).

While several factors contribute to the studio-dominated state of art education, the manner in which art teachers are prepared and their program requirements are a "major factor" in this trend (Lovano-Kerr 1985:219). Sevigny (1987) noted "One can only conclude that DBAE is at an impasse unless a major redesign of teacher education courses and requirements is implemented to realize the goals of DBAE." (109). Art Education continues to have a narrow scope because its teachers have been educated in this same manner leaving the teacher unprepared to teach the four art disciplines, let alone integrate them as DBAE requires (Lovano-Kerr 1985:220).

Discipline-based art education reform implications for teacher training are many. Zellers (1985) contended "Responsibility rests with university art education departments that perpetuate the artist-educator model..."(9). Lovano-Kerr (1985) stressed that "Higher education will be central" to any successful effort to reform art education, and that change must begin with the re-education of all prospective and practicing teachers (223). Sevigny (1987) in his discussion of the history of art education programs in U. S. universities stated that the separation of art education from the disciplines of art

dates back to the late 1930's when "...a differentiation between studies in art education and study in the disciplines of art." was established (98). In a related aspect Miller (1983) said that the separation of the art disciplines at the university level which exists "...because of faculty specialties is inappropriate and artificial in the public school art classroom." (37).

Because DBAE goals cannot be realized by simply embellishing an existing studio program, its "interdisciplinary structure" and "comprehensive approach" require a different structure for teacher preparation (Lovano-Kerr 1985:221). Along these lines Sevigny (1987) summarized "The foremost question for the immediate future is no longer what to teach, but rather how to teach. The challenge for the remainder of the decade is the opportunity to unite our purposes and to develop new models that bridge DBAE theory with teaching application." (121). Miller (1983) also commented on the great lack of methodology for teaching art in an integrated fashion (37).

After citing "antecedent programs" of DBAE, Sevigny (1987) concluded that "...the collaborative approach to teacher education is the most effective." to educate teachers in an integrated manner (120). He also stressed that if these reforms were going to become a reality, "parallel and collaborative programs" for both teachers in training as well as practicing teachers would be necessary. (120). Lovano-Kerr (1985) concurred and called for a

"...dialogue among representatives from the disciplines: studio artists, art historians, and aesteticians, and art educators." (221), for the purposes of sharing their respective viewpoints and orientations before "...determining the parameters of the discipline structure (221). Lovano-Kerr (1985) also believed this "interdisciplinary structure" would require the development of teaching methods for those courses that focus on integrating the four art disciplines and their classroom applications (221).

DBAE's "comprehensive approach" according to Lovano-Kerr (1985) also requires changes in course requirements and course content (221). Her recommendations are as follows: that art criticism and aesthetics should be separate requirements independent of art history; that "several" interdisciplinary courses be required; that methods courses would consist of separate courses addressing art curriculum development as well as general curriculum theory; and that studio courses be restricted to thirty to forty credits (222). She acknowledged these changes would require a fifth year of instruction for art education certification (222). Miller (1983) advocated an increase in art history course credits "...to a minimum of at least 18 hours" (37). Commenting on the realities university art education programs would face in light of such recommendations, Sevigny (1987) said:

> By 1980 we find a diminishing force of art

> education faculty being pressured to address new demands for an already overcrowded professional core. Acknowledged here is the fact that the size of a particular art education faculty influences the diversity of specialized course offerings and the range of curricula content available to art education students. Many programs that certify art teachers have limited professional teacher education staff. This impedes the potential to address the expanding content required for certification as well as the breadth or curriculum necessary to implement DBAE. (106).

A discipline-based approach also has implications for non-specialist art teachers (Hamblen 1987:72). Hamblen (1987) maintained the preparation of the elementary classroom teacher is of particular concern as the majority of elementary children in this country receive their art education from these teachers (72). Lovano-Kerr (1985) stressed that the current requirement of one or two methods courses in inadequate preparation for the non-art specialist teacher (222). She noted that increasing the methods course requirements "...may be an impossible goal, since the decision rests with another program." (222). Instead the author opted for changing the content of those art methods courses to incorporate the basic tenants and goals of DBAE and "...the kinds of content, processes, skills, and modes of inquiry of the four disciplines would replace the current emphasis on developing a sampling of studio art techniques and skills." (222). Lovano-Kerr (1985) also recommended the

use of DBAE textbooks to ensure a better quality curricula than is presently offered (222).

As previously mentioned Sevigny (1987) declared that while considerable attention has been devoted to defining the "what" of DBAE, most specifically its curriculum development, the methodologies and teacher training programs which would make DBAE implementation possible remain unaddressed (121). It is interesting to note that antecedents of DBAE such as the Standford Kettering Project (1969) and CEMEREL (1970) were involved with among other aspects developing teaching methodologies although neither were extensively involved with teacher education (Sevigny 1987:110). Both projects developed curriculum packets and gave short term workshops where teachers were to gain familiarity with the art concepts and the materials involved (Sevigny 1987:110, 112). Commenting on their limited success Sevigny (1987) concluded "...the lesson these antecedents should teach us is that improved art education is not just improved curriculum theory or structured curriculum packaging. When curriculum concepts and materials are separated from teacher aptitude and adaptation to specific situations, mere short term effectiveness is the likely result." (113).

While Wilson (1986) acknowledged the "theory into practice" dilemma as it relates to art criticism and DBAE in general (144), and Day (1987) asked "Art there any research reports that translate DBAE theory into classroom practice?"

(234), neither of their studies addressed training the art teacher. In both cases the authors and their colleagues taught classrooms of control and experimental groups (Day, 1987:235, Wilson 1986:137). Zeller (1985) a DBAE supporter questioned why art teachers cling to a studio orientation and refuse to reevaluate their approach to art education (10). Clearly DBAE's as yet incomplete agenda gives them little choice--as art teachers they have been inadequately trained to teach in the DBAE method, universities do not offer courses in criticism, aesthetics, or integrated methodologies they would require, and little or no integrated methodologies exist to aid them.

Just as The Getty Center for Education in the Arts continues to influence art education reform with its creation and advocation of DBAE, the Getty Center has also chosen to focus its attention on museum education. Leilani Lattin Duke, Director of The Getty Center for Education in the Arts commented in the forward of The Uncertain Profession: Observation on the State of Museum Education in Twenty American art Museums (1986), that "Over the past two years The Getty Center for Education in the Arts and the J. Paul Getty Museums have studied museum education in order to stimulate dialogue among museum professionals about how the appreciation of works of art can be intensified." Duke also noted that in 1984 the Center sponsored an issue of the Journal of Aesthetic Education 19.2 (Summer 1985) dedicated solely to art museums and museum education, as well as

commissioning a study authored by Drs. Dobbs and Eisner (1986) regarding the unfulfilled educational mission of art museums and how the museum's educational potential might be more fully realized (Dobbs and Eisner 1986:forward).

David Kamansky, Director Pacific Asian Museum and a panelist addressing "DBAE's Impact on Museum Education" stated "If museum and classroom educators work together to "fine tune" the program, museums will benefit from more educated audiences, and there may eventually be a positive change in the attitude of the general public toward art institutions and art itself." (Getty Center for Education in the Arts 1987:89-90). Commenting along these lines Patterson Williams, Director of Education, Denver Art Museum, and co-panelist emphasized that "...DBAE has the potential to revolutionize the way we think about and serve the public museums." (Getty Center for Education in the Arts 1987:93). Just as Kamansky and Williams spoke of the potential contribution DBAE could make to art museums, Brett Waller, Associate Director, Education and Public Affairs, The J. Paul Getty Museum, and also a co-panelist discussed the other side of the coin when he suggested that "...museums can play a more constructive more active role in helping teachers and students realize the full promise of DBAE." (Getty Center for Education in the Arts 1987:91).

DBAE's theoretical linkage with museums stems from its emphasis upon the study of original works of art being central to DBAE curricula (Clark, Day, and Greer 1987:146).

The authors concluded "This need to encounter original works of art in addition to the use of reproductions in schools naturally connects DBAE with museum education. When students have learned to encounter works of art, it is often in museums that opportunities are created to build greater appreciation and depth of understanding with works of art." (146).

Kleinbauer (1987) stressed if students are ever to become visually literate about their own works, the works of others, as well as their environment "works of the past must be employed" by art instructors "...through the physical presence of actual works of art in the classroom or museum..." (207). Art education in a DBAE program focuses on learning from objects as that learning relates to the four disciplines and "...learning from objects in the core curriculum of the museum visit..." (Zeller 1985:7). According to Clark, Day, and Greer (1987) DBAE "Teachers are encouraged to use their communities resources in such places as museums, galleries, public buildings, and individual collections for students of all ages (146). Zeller (1987) noted that DBAE's structure and guidelines should serve both art instructors and museum educators in their "complementary activities" (54).

Part III. Museum Education and The Museum-School Relationship

Art education reform movements despite differences in terminology--whether it's called DBAE or basic arts education--share the same desire to expand and enrich art and humanities content (MacGregor 1987:84). This curricular shift and call for excellence has direct implications for our cultural institutions, particularly museums and the museum educators they employ (Zeller 1985:6). Muhlberger (1985) commented "As public demands for higher achievement in elementary and secondary education increase, the art museum is proving itself one of the few institutions ready to assist in meeting the challenge. Enlightened art educators in public education who attempt to change from the old single emphasis, studio-oriented teaching of art to a broader approach in which aesthetics, art history, art criticism, and the techniques of the studio all receive equal weight find the museum educator the only possible partner in their endeavor to reach this goal." (93).

Newson and Silvers (1978) in their study of American museums stressed that from their earliest inception American museums have been educationally oriented institutions, however this educational orientation continues to evolve as a result of changes in society and art education (13). The authors said that although these museums may not have been considered as "...primarily educational, that concept grew with the pragmatism and 'progressive' education of the

twenties and thirties and, in particular, with the intensified money pressures that came to a climax with the Tax Reform Act of 1969." (21). According to Silvers (1978) the Tax Act of 1969 brought into question whether museums really function as educators and if they do what type of learning takes place and what is the value of object-centered learning in a "word and sound oriented society." (21).

Although museums have a legal obligation and a financial incentive to educate, the state of museum education is as yet unfulfilled. (Newsom and Silvers 1978:21, 33). The Commission on Museums for a New Century (1984) emphasized "museums have yet to realize their full potential as educational institutions." (59). The Commission blamed this unfulfilled mission in part on "....a paradox of significant proportions, a tension of values that is inherent in the very mission of museums. State quite simply the concerns of preservation and the demands of public access are a contradiction lived out in every institution." (58). Dobbs and Eisner (1986) also addressed this mission conflict "The collection, preservation, and conservation of works of art is considered by many the chief mission of the American art museum, even though, as we have pointed out, the founding charters of many venerable institutions place education as a priority second to none." (35). This confusion as to whether a museum's primary function is curatorial and object oriented, or educational and audience oriented in nature is according to The W. K. Kellogg Foundation (1988) "...at the heart of

many institutional conflicts." (6). Dobbs and Eisner (1986) suggested that curators and museum educators must begin to perceive their functions as "complementary, not competitive" (14), while The W. K. Kellogg Foundation (1988) also targeted the need for staff "teamwork", and "cross-fertilization" among its members (76). Newson and Silvers (1978) also attributed the museum's limited success as an educator to the nature of museum learning or the "museum experience" of which very little is known (63). The Commission on Museums for a New Century (1984) noted "...museums provide a variety of experiences that fulfill a spectrum of human needs and that are not in quite the same way, available anywhere else." (59), yet there exists no consensus on how we learn from objects (57). The Commission believed that this confusion stems from the lack of "....articulation regarding the nature of the learning experience." (57). Museum learning research has been traditionally limited to such fringe areas as: "demographic profiles", "time-motion studies of visitor behavior", and "seasonal visiting patterns" (Newson and Silvers 1978:63). Zellers (1987) termed museums as "unique environments where learning is non-sequential, informal..." and "...geared to enlightened recreation rather than the accumulation of large amounts of information." (53). The Commission on Museums for a New Century (1984) said museum learning was spontaneous and individualized and "urged a high priority for research" into the nature of museum and object centered

learning, and the necessity for developing a more objective manner of measuring museum learning, which is currently unquantifiable (66).

Along these lines Dobbs and Eisner (1986) commented upon "...the dearth of theory available to inform their practice. Frequently programs are developed without any intellectual substratum or curricular platform which would clearly identify the values, beliefs, and assumptions about learning..." (31). Dobbs and Eisner (1986) believed that museum's ineffectiveness also stems from "...a lack of consensus among museum professionals regarding the basic aims of museum education." (6). Their study of twenty U. S. museums revealed that the museum educator's function and role within the professional museum staff is unclear, that there is no "articulated description" of what education is or is not, and that "There are widely different attitudes toward museum education and museum educators among directors." (6, 8, 10). Dobbs and Eisner (1986) attributed the generally negative attitudes museum directors held for museum educators as a carry over from their negative perceptions of art education in the schools (41), and that many museum directors underestimate the educational skills required to help people learn to think about and perceive art (9).

Newson and Silvers (1978) earlier assessment also found that "...there is no single or consistent art museum view of how best to educate." (78). Dobbs and Eisner (1968) interviewed museum directors whose views varied from a

belief that "just opening the doors" is all the patron requires and that the "art object has the power to speak for itself", to a philosophy of education that believes that "everyone in the museum is an educator" and "everything one does in the museum is of educational consequence."(40). According to Newson and Silvers (1978) the areas museum educators should address in their professional duties such as: aesthetics, art history, visual literacy and perception, criticism skills, and social reform are equally unclear (78). Goodman (1985) in an address to the Association of American Museums argued "Basic research can supply no fast and full and final answers, but I am convinced that cooperation between research and practice is as much needed in making works work as in making crops grow..." (62). He also pointed out that visitor learning experiences are limited by the museum environment itself--that curatorial matters relating to preserving and protecting the object make the museum "...a place hostile to the achievement of its own main purpose." (60).

It has been pointed out that conflicts between curatorial and educational responsibilities, a lack of consensus regarding the museum educator, the means he should use to educate and how he should measure it, and the void of research regarding object centered learning all contribute to the unrealized educational potential of the museum. One significant factor remains--that of the profession of the museum educator himself and his "second class" status

(Williams 1985:105). It is no coincidence that Dobbs and Eisner (1986) in their study of the state of museum education entitled their work "The Uncertain Profession:...". The authors noted that "Museums secure their reputations on the size and quality of their collections. No art museum in America is known primarily for the quality of its museum education program." (21). Dobbs and Eisner (1986) in their interviews with museum educators concluded that educators see themselves as having little power or self-determination to influence museum policy, that they "...are at the bottom of the status hierarchy in museums." (20), and that their work goes unacknowledged and unappreciated for their contribution (23). These perceptions are further supported by the fact that no advancement positions exist for museum educators and their salaries are on a lower scale than those of their colleagues (20). Luckett (1985) stated museum educators are seen as "...people who were either failed teachers or failed curators, who by definition would not be able to contribute anything to the serious work of the gallery, who would be incapable of participating in research, and who would never have any influence on purchasing decisions." (129). In addition Dobbs and Eisner (1986) observed that universities have made no commitment to the museum education profession ironically because it "lacks the features of a discipline" without theoretical foundation, professional role models, and methods of evaluation (43). Because only two university

accredited programs exist in the U. S. for museum educators it is impossible for "...those in the field to attain legitimacy and maturation." (Dobbs and Eisner 1986:42, 44). Yet another constraint placed on the museum educator is the stigma attached to the word "education" which "...paradoxically confers a negative image on those who claim to be specialists at it while, at the same time those who see education in a negative light often claim it is the responsibility of everyone working in the museum." (Dobbs and Eisner 1986:13).

Just as the state of museum education has remained unfulfilled, the museum's relationship with the schools has also failed to realize its potential (Dobbs and Eisner 1986:64). Newson and Silvers (1978) said that museums and schools have the potential to serve each other's needs, and all too often museums find themselves dependent on the schools for large segments of their audience, while the schools seek from the museums expertise they cannot provide (262). The authors discovered widely opposing opinions among museum directors regarding museum-school relations ranging from those who consider it "...good politics as well as good policy" to those who believe museums are not "...for the use of people in their larval or school-going stage of existence." (18). Despite the disparity of opinions the sheer numbers of museums nationwide with educational programs for the schools--nine out of every ten--gives some measure of their desire to educate the young (Newson and

Silvers 1978:259).

Regarding visual education and its relationship to museums and schools, Newson and Silvers (1978) concluded "...visual learning is the form of education least likely to be taught in America's schools, and even in its colleges, though undergraduate art history survey courses appear to be making an impact. Some art museum educators and curators have accepted, as part of their professional responsibility, the task of helping museum visitors re-learn to use their eyes, to see,..." (77). Goodman (1984) emphasized in his analogy of museums and libraries that while visitors of libraries know how to read books, museum patrons must be taught skills of visual literacy in order to use and enjoy the museum (56). An unstated objective for museum educators to teach visual literacy is their hope for reforming art education in the schools (Newson and Silvers 1978:270).

The reform of educational methods is also being undertaken in the museums, as museum educators have been increasingly dissatisfied with their staple--the "one shot" docent-led group tour (Newson and Silvers 1978:267). In the museums studied by Newson and Silvers (1978) while the majority are still using the single visit method, many museum educators are beginning to accept the idea of a series of visits as a viable alternative to a "sight-seeing" and "service station approach". (268). Supporters argue that important objectives such as "sequence and reinforcement" and the development of a teacher-student rapport, and

the "museum habit" could only be possible with a series of visits (Newson and Silvers 1978:268).

Although the single versus multiple visit issue is unresolved, difficulty also stems from the museum's reliance on docents (Newson and Silvers 1978:244). Because the docent is a necessity for most museum budgets, the museums are compromised in their professional expectations of these volunteers (Newson and Silvers 1978:244). The authors noted recent reform trends in museum education have shifted away from the formal art history lectures and "background hour" to a more active informal "hands-on" approach which is more "experience-oriented rather than object-oriented,"...(267).

Dobbs and Eisner's (1986) studies found that most museum programs for the schools are primary school oriented and that few resources are dedicated to developing high school audiences (67). Newson and Silvers (1978) concluded "...there is evidence here that high school students may be an even more appropriate audience for art museums...", and that the museum educator can in turn "...offer high school students an approach to the study not only of art but of academic subjects related to it that most high school faculty members, who are required in virtually no colleges of education to take courses in art history, are not equipped to give them." (263).

Despite efforts in the 1930's and 1940's to build a relationship between schools and museums, little has changed and reasons for a limited relationship between the two

institutions continue to exist (Newson and Silvers 1978:400). These authors believed art in secondary schools "...has been deemed useless for students going straight to work after high school and unnecessary for students preparing for college, as high school art courses have customarily carried no credit for college admission." (Newson and Silvers 1978:400). The Commission on Museums for a New Century (1984) cited the inflexibility of class scheduling to allow students to leave school and come to the museum as a major impediment (67). On the museum side there are the serious constraints of limited museum education budgets, and museum education staffs which are presently too small and overburdened with their education responsibilities now, let alone the thought of expanding their role as "new learning centers." (Newson and Silvers 1978:404).

Beyond such practical considerations as budgets, scheduling logistics, and restricted educational staffs, there are basic philosophical differences in orientation and goals which also contribute to this limited relationship (Newson and Silvers 1978:261, 266). Newson and Silvers (1978) concluded from their interviews that museums are at odds with schools because they perceive the schools as having little if no value for art (262). Both institutions address different content in art, and schools and their teachers value only measurable learning (Zeller 1985:7, 8). Regarding their basic differences Newson and Silvers (1978) stressed "...museums are not schools, and museum education

is not the same as schooling.", but that they are instead a "parallel educational system, neither extensions of schools or supplements to them." (261). The Commission on Museums for a New Century (1984) voiced the opinion that a museum-school partnership should be a "completing" process not one of just enrichment (67), while Zeller (1985) contended that museum educators should "...be laying foundations for lifelong learning rather than providing enrichment to classroom learning." (9).

Although museums and schools may share such common goals as "awareness of the larger world", and "cultural history" they have significant differences as well (Newson and Silvers 1978:269). It has been previously mentioned that museum educators have an often unspoken goal of wanting "...to change what happens in the schools." (Newson and Silvers 1978:270). In their study of fifteen school visit programs, Newson and Silvers (1978) listed the following as most commonly identified goals: 1) helping visitors to enjoy and feel at ease in the museum environment; 2) to teach visual literacy, perception, and sensory education; and 3) to help visitors develop an aesthetic appreciation for art (260).

Museum educators have realized for some time that schools have goals for visitations which are out of synchronization with museum priorities (Newson and Silvers 1978:269). The Commission on Museums for a New Century (1984) noted that to the detriment of the museum experience

schools are more concerned with their curricular needs and applications than with the strengths of that particular museum (67). Zeller (1985) maintained that schools need to understand and accept that people learn in museums in different ways than they do in the schools and that "...to make the museum experience an extension of the classroom..." is unfair to the museums and counterproductive for the schools (7).

Another important problem limiting the museum-school relationship is the lack of cooperation and communication between the two institutions (Newson and Silvers 1978:262). These authors stressed "...the importance of cooperative planning between museums and the schools.", and that "The relation between museums and schools must be, then, the familiar two-way street." (262). The Commission on Museums for a New Century (1984) considered communication between museum educators and teachers, regarding common goals they can together offer, a "fundamental issue", and recommended that a national colloquium of participants from "government, business, the academic community, and schools and museums" be convened to discuss the mutually beneficial relationship museums and schools should have (69). Newson and Silvers (1978) commented on the lack of collaborative curriculum development between the two institutions saying "...that art museums are wrong to devise programs and present them as products to the schools ready to be accepted and used...", that this responsibility must be shared, and that teachers

should have their input if a genuine partnership is ever to be developed (272).

It has been previously noted that museum education seriously lacks any research base regarding object-centered learning, that museum educators are not trained in research methods, and that this research is a necessity if the field of museum education is ever to "strengthen its own intellectual integrity" (Dobbs and Eisner 1986:58). Newson and Silvers (1978) pointed out that museum educators also lacks a data base regarding schools needs and perceptions, and are for the most part out of touch with the classroom realities confronting teachers daily (467, 271).

Just as museum educators have a low opinion of art education in the schools perceiving it as merely happy-hands activities, these museum educators also feel "...they have more to teach the school teacher than to learn from him;" (Newson and Silvers 1978:271). Zeller (1985) stressed school teachers don't understand these museum educators' goals, or appreciate their efforts, and that these teachers are essentially museum illiterates (7). Summing up the state of this mutual ignorance Newson and Silvers (1978) commented "It is a rare teacher who knows the museum, perhaps, but it seems to be a rarer museum educator who knows the school." (467). It is clear that the basic differences existing between museums and schools contributes to the negative perceptions each has of the other, and the weak alliance and poor working rela- tionship between the two institutions (Newson and Silvers 1978:271).

Conclusions

The study has shown that there are art education reformers oriented toward widening the scope of art education who see this impetus as both an extension of the excellence movement and as a means of achieving fundamental reforms in basic arts education as well. The call for revitalizing and expanding the content of the arts has come from outside the schools, most notably The Getty Center for Education in the Arts and The National Endowment for the Arts however, universities and museum staffs must also examine how their collaboration with the schools and their teachers could significantly aid in realizing the goals of DBAE and the "basic arts education". In spite of the efforts from these two very influential sponsors much remains unresolved, particularly the development of integrated teaching methodologies, reforms in teacher education requirements, programs which would form a successful alliance between museum educators and art teachers, and research regarding the nature of object centered learning.

RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that:

1. Regarding art teacher training universities need: 1) to develop methodologies for prospective art teachers to teach an expanded content in an integrated fashion; and 2) to teach prospective art teachers to value the museum as an educational resource (both for their students as well as their own continuing education) and the museum educator as a professional trained for interdisciplinary teaching.
2. University art education programs need to re-vamp their requirements particularly through the addition of courses in the areas of: art history, criticism, aesthetics, and integrated methods.
3. It is important that museum educators initiate research into object centered learning which would benefit art teachers in developing learning methodologies as well as provide a much needed theoretical base for the profession of the museum educator.
4. The Getty Center for Education in the Arts should continue its research into bridging new relationships between the museum educator and the DBAE teacher, and play a role in designing museum programs for schools and teacher training which would include the concerns and interests of both professions.

5. There is a distinct need for an updated study focusing on the state of museums and their role as an educator on the same extensive scale of research as completed by Newson and Silvers in 1978.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adler, Mortimer. The Paideia Proposal. New York, N.Y.: Publishing Co., 1982.

Cheney, L. V. American Memory: A Report on the Humanities in the Nation's Public Schools. Washington D. C.: National Endowment for the Humanities, 1987.

Clark, Gilbert A., Michael D. Day, and D. Dwaine Greer. "Discipline-based-Art Education: Becoming Students of Art." Journal of Aesthetic Education 21.2 (Summer 1987): 129-193.

Commission on Museums for a New Century. Museums for a New Century. Washington D. C.: American Association of Museums, 1984.

Day, Michael D. "Discipline-based Art Education in Secondary Classroom." Studies in Art Education 28.4 (1987): 234-42.

Dobbs, Stephen M., and Elliot W. Eisner. The Uncertain Profession: Observations on the State of Museum Education in Twenty American Art Museums. Los Angeles, CA.: Getty Center for Education in the Arts. 1986.

Eisner, Elliot, "The Role of Discipline-Based Art Education in America's Schools." Art Education 40 (September 1987): 6-45.

Galbraith, Lynn, and Marvin J. Spomer. "Does Art History Go to School?" Art Education 39 (September 1986): 10-13.

Getty Center for Education in the Arts. Beyond Creating: The Place for Art in America's Schools.. Los Angeles: Ca.: J. Paul Getty Trust, April 1985.

Getty Center for Education in the Arts. "Discipline-Based Art Education: What Forms Will It Take?" National Invitational Conferences. Los Angles, Ca: Getty Center for Education in the Arts, January 1987.

Goodlad, John I. "What Some Schools and Classrooms Teach." Educational Leadership 40.7 (April 1983): 8-19.

Goodman, Nelson. "The End of the Museum?" Journal of Aesthetic Education 19.2 (Summer 1985): 53.62.

Greer, D. Dwaine. "Discipline-Based Art Education: Approaching Art as a Subject of Study." Studies in Art Education 25.4 (1984): 212-218.

Hamblen, Karen. "An Examination of Discipline-based Art Education Issues.: Studies in Art Education 28.2 (1987): 68-78.

Hamblen, Karen. "What Does DBAE Teach?" Art Education 42 (March 1988): 23-35.

Kerr, Jessie Lovano-. "Implications of DBAE for University Education of Teachers." Studies in Art Education 26.4 (1985): 216-23.

Kleinbauer, E. Eugene. "Art History in Discipline-based Art Education." Journal of Aesthetic Education 21.2 (Summer 1987): 205-215.

Luckett, Helen. "Ten Years of Gallery Education." Journal of Aesthetic Education 19.2 (Summer 1985): 125-42.

MacGregor, Nancy Parker. "Aesthetic Education and Current Trends Affecting Art Education." Journal of Aesthetic Education 20.4 (Winter 1986): 83-6.

Miller, Phyllis K. "Art Teacher Training Must Change!" Art Education 36.5 (September 1983): 36-7.

Muhlberger, Richard. "After Art History, What? A Personal View of the Shaping of Art Museum Education." Journal of Aesthetic Education 19.2 (Summer 1985): 93-103.

Newson, Barbara and Adele Silver. The Art Museum as Educator. Berkley Ca.: University of California Press, 1978.

Sevigny, Maurice. "Discipline-based Art Education and Teacher Education." Journal of Aesthetic Education 21.2 (Summer 1987): 95-121.

Smoke, Jerry. "Art History and Aesthetics in the Secondary School." In Research Readings for Discipline-based Art Education: A Journey Beyond Creating. Ed. Mark Dobbs. Los Angeles, Ca.: The National Art Education Association, 1988.

Toward Civilization: A Report on Arts Education. Washington D. C.: National Endowment for the Arts. May, 1988.

Williams, Patterson B. "Educational Excellence in Art Museums: An Agenda for Reform." Journal of Aesthetic Education 19.2 (Summer 1985): 105-23).

Wilson, Brent. "Art Criticism, As Writing As Well As Talking." In Research Readings for Discipline-based Art Education: A Journey Beyond Creating. Ed. Mark Dobbs. Los Angeles, Ca.: The National Art Education Association, 1988.

W. K. Kellogg Foundation. Open Conversations: Strategies for Professional Development in Museums. Chicago: Department of Education, Field Museum of Natural History, 1988.

Zeller, Terry. "Museums and the Goals of Art Education." Art Education 40 (January 1987): 50-5.

Zeller, Terry. "Museum Education and School Art: Different Ends and Different Means." Art Education 38.3 (May 1985): 6-10.

STUDENT QUALIFICATIONS

Name: Julia A. Molinaro

Address: R. R. #7, Box 255
Rochester, IN 46975

Education: B. A. Art Education, Manchester College
North Manchester, IN
Currently completing M. S. in
Secondary Education

Employment: 9 years Art Instructor, Rochester
Community High School, Rochester, IN